

H
7N196

ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER

Published Semi-Monthly by

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, Inc.

Empire State Bldg., New York 1, N. Y.
903 First National Bank Bldg., Utica 2, N. Y.
834 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.

Council Letter No. 218

July 1, 1949

July Fourth

In September, 1830, the Government proposed to scrap the old frigate "Constitution," as no longer fit for service.

It took time for the public to wake up. Oliver Wendell Holmes then wrote his immortal poem "Old Ironsides." Probably Holmes' lines are little noticed in our schools and colleges these days. But every man or woman now over fifty was, at one time or another, we are sure, required in school to learn and recite the verses, which began:

"Ay, tear her tattered ensign down!
Long has it waved on high,
And many an eye has danced to see
That banner in the sky."

Holmes reached the hearts of the American people. They rose up and demanded the ship be preserved. And she remains today.

The people of those days could not tolerate that even a symbol of their liberty should be destroyed.

Today Not the Symbol but the Substance Is Threatened

Yet today not merely the symbol but the Constitution itself is in as grave danger of destruction as was that ship. If any important part of the plans concocted by the American Politburo and set forth in messages to Congress by the Prisoner of the White House gets through, the Constitution itself and all it stands for will have been scrapped.

Edwin Borchard and John Bassett Moore

One of the greatest Americans, and incidentally one of the greatest Jews of America, is Professor Edwin Borchard of Yale. Recently he wrote his "Valedictory Editorial" in the *American Journal of International Law*. He said, in part:

"That I am not in sympathy with aims and procedure adopted by this Government is apparent to all readers. It will be more novel to learn that John Bassett Moore in at least three places of his forthcoming memoirs characterizes the [foreign] policy

of this Government—if it can be called a policy—as 'insane.' That means more for the reader than an ordinary invective. The ordinary reader must know that John Bassett Moore was a man of great moderation who used strong words but rarely. His opinion on a question of international law or policy is rated among the highest in this country. No one was more familiar with our history than he was. . . .

The Birthday of the Republic

On July 4, 1949, the American Republic will be 173 years old.

Traditionally, it is a day of celebration, of pride in the faith and courage of the men who, to become free, pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor—and left the issue in the hand of God.

July 4 is still a day to thank God for what they did. But this Independence Day it is necessary for every American to do something more. *Every American who loves his country needs now to do the straightest thinking he has ever done in his life.*

For July 4, 1949, may be the last Independence Day Americans will celebrate as *citizens of a free and independent nation*. Of course, whatever comes, however the sovereignty of the United States may be impaired, the crafty politicians who have accomplished their purpose will still take leading parts in future celebrations of "Independence Day." Washington's Farewell Address will still be read in Congress on February 22nd. But once individual and national freedom have been thrown on the scrap-heap of history, such celebrations will be without reality or meaning. They will be even flatter than the continued celebration of "Armistice Day" on November 11.

The attack on our American liberties comes on two fronts. One front is foreign policy, the other domestic policy. The two intertwine. "Foreign Policy" decisions have increasingly been used as a means for the direction and control of domestic policy. This has led to the irony whereby some legislators, in opposing the Administration on domestic issues while supporting it on "foreign policy," actually help the Administration fasten collectivist controls on our internal economy!

On the "foreign policy" side, such issues as "World Government," the International Trade Organization Charter (ITO), the "Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention" and "The Employment Service Convention" (both latter treaties sponsored by the leftish International Labor Organization), while ostensibly dealing with foreign relations, are actually designed to subjugate the internal economy of the United States. The vast sums of money poured out like water by the Administration over the world likewise are having a collectivizing effect upon our internal economy.

Confusion in the domestic scene is compounded. Even some who think of themselves as doughty champions of American freedom have become amazingly confused. Senator Robert Taft, for example, once generally considered a foremost champion of American freedom, has now become the exemplar of those who cry, "Let us have *some* Socialism in order to avoid *complete* Socialism." As he faces a re-election fight in Ohio next year—made more difficult, we believe, because of his compromises—Senator Taft and his advisers probably think this appeasement strategy politically smart. But it is inept and stupid on the very political level at which it is supposed to be clever.

Even if it were clever, it would be a complete abdication of statesmanship. In essence it is the "me-too" disease, incubated at the instance of the very American Politburo that controls the Democratic Party. It has paralyzed the Republican Party the last four Presidential elections. It has infected large segments of that party's elected legislators.

Bi-partisan Foreign Policy a Chief Tool of Collectivism

All this adds up to the fact that Collectivism is being fastened upon the United States through manipulation of a supposedly "bi-partisan foreign policy," as well as through a domestic program of disguised Socialism. The Administration has persuaded possible opponents obligingly to tie their own hands under an alleged "bi-partisan foreign policy," while their opposition on domestic issues is confused and divided because some of the natural opponents of American National Socialism think they are playing deep politics.

When these facts are seen in their real relation, it will be clear how greatly America needs coherent, intelligent, courageous opposition to Socialism, whether it shows its head in foreign policy or in domestic "humanitarian" legislation. Unless such opposition emerges, and emerges soon, the Republic born on July 4, 1776, will perish. The outer form may remain. The reality will be gone.

Here Is the Question

This leads to one obvious question:

Why the Republican Party?

It is natural for those who oppose the socialization of America to look to an opposition party. But there is none.

For the other major party does not act like an opposition. It does not think like an opposition. With

rare and notable exceptions, it acts and thinks like a permanently beaten and merely tolerated relic of the past, clinging weakly to a political philosophy which it has neither the sense nor the courage manfully to champion.

But if those in control of the badly confused Republican Party could only understand it, the philosophy and the dream of human freedom is not dead among the people of America. It is very much alive—and is praying for leadership. News and editorial writers try to create the opposite impression, for alien-minded left-wingers have told them that love of freedom is dead, and they have swallowed the misrepresentation.

We are convinced from contact with large segments of the people, and from first-hand reports of many others, that overwhelmingly the people believe in freedom and are opposed to any form of Socialism. This fact eluded such men as Dewey and Warren—and now Taft. Of course, it eluded Mr. Willkie.

The alien-minded "Satan" who got control of the Democratic Party has now taken many Republican leaders to the top of a high mountain and persuaded them to be his servants—even as are most leaders of the Democratic Party.

Why, then, it may be asked, did the Democrats win last November?

The answer is simple. The Democrats won because the liberty-loving American people never had a chance to vote for liberty as opposed to Collectivism. No choice was offered. Some of them held their noses and voted for Dewey. Several millions, enough to have changed the result, held their noses and remained at home—or, as in Ohio, voted for governor and other officers, but cast no vote for President.

We Predicted Just What Is Happening

This should not have been a surprise to anybody. At least it should not have been a surprise to readers of National Economic Council publications. Through left-wing infiltration of the Republican Party, the result was "fixed."

The last few years the Council has warned of the consequences of me-too-ism. In an open letter to the members of the 80th Congress (Letter No. 190) we warned again:

"The American people, in the general elections to be held this year, have the right to a clear-cut choice between New Deal policies and policies traditionally American. When they elected you in 1946 they knew what they wanted. Had you followed a consistent, full-scale policy of rooting out the discredited New Deal in domestic life and of refusing to go into New Deal leading strings in the conduct of our foreign affairs, you would at this moment enjoy a popularity accorded to few men in American public life.

"But, while you have carried out portions of your mandate, you have in other matters acted contrary to it and as to other vital issues, you have ignored them altogether. If you carry this policy of timidity—of subservience to those you defeated in the 1946 elections, into the next electoral contest, we

predict that many of you will not be in Washington next January except to clean out your desks. For the 1948 elections are far from being "in the bag."

How many hapless Republicans who returned to Washington in January to clean out their desks remembered this warning, we cannot say. But we can say that a considerable number who squeaked through in 1948 will return in January, 1950, also for the sole purpose of cleaning out their desks—unless they wake up to what really is going on in the U.S.A. When they do, they will realize that the "deep, smart politics" of those who want to compromise with Socialism and the American people want Freedom, is, in fact, the politics of failure.

If anyone in public life is too dim-witted to see the issue now, let him resign himself to political oblivion. For among a free people the ultimate in statesmanship and the ultimate in politics are one—to stand foursquare for Freedom in all its implications, and to make the issue involved crystal-clear to the people. The man or the party who does this will stand upon high moral ground. He will not compromise his principles to win the votes of any pressure group. And in the long run he will win.

Just How Impractical Can a "Practical Politician" Be?

A good deal of gentle laughter—and some not so gentle—greeted our predictions. The elections of 1948 were "in the bag." The only thing the "practical politicians" neglected to find out was, "In whose bag?"

After the debacle of 1948, did the "practical politicians" troop to the mourner's bench, confess their sin and resolve to lead a new life?

In the 81st Congress a solid group of consistent, intelligent, courageous—and therefore *really* practical—Republicans has fought Truman Collectivism at every step. But in both Houses many elected Republicans are still befuddled by the nonsense of playing the politics of compromise. They are still under the delusion that the way to beat Socialism is by adopting a quarter or a half of the socialist program. That, they reason, will "stop them." They do not realize that Fabian Socialists will take all they can get this year, and then come back year after year, until they get it all. How many times do our appeasers need to be exposed to reality before they recognize it?

Two Examples

Two examples from the current Congress illustrate the bankruptcy in Republican leadership. We have mentioned Senator Taft. Without question he loves America, and he has one of the best minds in the Senate. Yet he has swallowed, hook, line and sinker, the fantastic notion that the "practical" way to beat Socialism is to have a little but not too much. So again he co-sponsors the "Public Housing" bill which over a period of years would commit the people to spend billions to provide housing for a small part of the people at the expense of the rest.

In this recent wooing of the left-wing, Senator Taft is out of character.

If he continues in his me-too-ism, adopting this and

that part of the Collectivist program, he will be defeated by whatever candidate the Democrats put up. At least a hundred thousand heart-sick Americans who live in Ohio will "stay at home" on election day.

Then there is Mr. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Minority Leader of the House. Last January Mr. Martin introduced H.R. 1766, called the "Public School Plant Facilities Act," which appropriates \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950, and authorizes the same amount for 1951 and for 1952. This would give the several states \$900,000,000 in three years for the construction of school buildings.

Now it has not been demonstrated that the local communities and the states *cannot* build schools, or that the Federal Government ought to build them. Moreover, this bill is the companion to the Administration's \$300,000,000 Federal "Aid" to Education proposals which, if enacted, would mean Federal Control of Education, and eventual totalitarian Federal thought control over the children of America. The proponents of Federal control of education have been taking one bill at a time; but the understanding throughout the educational world is that when the "Aid" bill is safely passed the construction bill will be brought up next. If it should be passed, Federal control of the field of public education will be nailed down tight.

We do not know whether Mr. Martin introduced this bill at the solicitation of someone else or as his own idea. The essential point is that he introduced it, and to that extent threw the influence of his party leadership on the side of one great plank of the National Socialist platform.

What we have said about Mr. Taft and Mr. Martin is true of many Republican leaders. Only a revolutionary reversal, whereby the party purges itself of incipient and advanced Statism, can give that party either real leadership or any chance of returning to power. If the party does not vigorously oppose Truman's entire program for National Socialism, it has no excuse for existence. It will never win another national election. The more it apes the New Deal, the worse will be its defeat.

And every national election lost means one more blow at American liberty.

But There Is an Answer

Failing such a revolutionary change, where can Americans look for leadership untainted by statist compromise? Recent events provide the answer.

Americans whose true interest and convictions are alike can work together. The most significant development of the 81st Congress has been the emergence of the so-called "Dixiecrat-Conservative Republican Coalition." The term is not entirely accurate, for not all Southern Democrats judged it expedient to align themselves with the Thurmond campaign. Nor are the Republicans who have worked with certain Southern Democrats *conservative* in the sense of being opposed to any truly progressive or liberal measures.

This cooperation, more effective on some issues than on others, has resulted from the conviction that the safety and welfare of the United States is more important than party lines.

We think the basis upon which this temporary "coalition" rests is actually a solid basic philosophy of government—the philosophy embodied in the Constitution of the United States. Both parties are equally threatened by the activities of the Socialists who dominate the Administration. It is the object of these Socialist Planners to smash both the Republican Party in the North and the Democratic Party in the South. Here is the blueprint: The New Dealers plan to pass FEPC and similar legislation *with the help of dumb Republicans, who can see the Negro vote in the North, but nothing more.* With FEPC once established, the Negro and the so-called "poor white" are to be welded into the New Deal Party of the South—which the Planners believe can dominate the South. Then the so-called Dixiecrats, no longer dominant in their states, and the other now-dominant Southern Democrats, will be expelled from the New Deal Party. The alliance will sew up the Negro vote for the New Deal, North and South. In the meantime, the New Deal party, with cold calculation, is commencing to "buy up" the farm belt with the bare-faced corruption called the "Brannan Plan." It expects to succeed. Then, with the New Deal urban vote, the Government "Payroll Vote," the mid-West farm vote and the vote of the "New South," it expects to dominate the political picture permanently.

America will then become a one-party country and there will be no parliamentary opposition worthy of the name to block or to criticize. Our economy will be Socialist, we will be a Fascist police state, and the independence of the United States will be surrendered to a world superstate controlled by the Zionist-Communists.

Those who love the Republic and to whom freedom is the most important value in life, must combine their efforts now. If they cannot or will not, the strategic, decisive moment of opportunity will pass, never to return. They must find some means of acting in association as long as the attack upon liberty goes on.

There is just one way, as we see it. Let the so-called coalition be given permanent form and coherent reality. Let the real Americans among the Republicans cease at once their silly effort to win the Negro vote by supporting the New Dealers on FEPC. Let a convention be held in the early spring of 1950 at which anti-Collectivist Republicans and anti-Collectivist Democrats, North and South, can meet for creation of a new party. In order to effect this creation, let both Democrats and Republicans forego their honored names, and begin with a clean slate under some such title as "The American Party." Let it above all else be the party for freedom.

In other words, let men and women who think alike act together.

Then let that Party go to the people with a clear issue in the Congressional elections of 1950. It can win the South. It can win the mid-West, for the Brannan Plan fatally misconstrues the intelligence and patriotism of the American farmer. It can win New England, New York and New Jersey. It can carry the great plains and the Northwest. It will be a party

with a clear issue and a clear program. And the American people will have the clear choice for which they have so far waited in vain.

In our considered judgment only this program or something like it can prevent the Zionist-Communist elements, acting through the New Deal Party and its Republican dupes, from seizing permanent control of the Government. The Republican Party has demonstrated that alone it is incapable of furnishing the required opposition.

Do we wish to keep our independent Republic, or lose it? Do we wish to keep our freedom as individuals, or throw it away?

We must choose quickly, or the power to choose will be lost forever.

Mervyn K. Hart
President,

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, Inc.

Send subscriptions to New York Office

Subscription price of Council Letter, issued semi-monthly; Action Report and Council Papers, issued occasionally; together with Council Review of Books, edited by Rose Wilder Lane, issued monthly:

12 months.....	\$10.00
6 months.....	6.00
3 months.....	3.50
Airmail—Domestic.....	11.44
Airmail—Western Europe.....	18.00
Other countries—Rates on request	

Special rate for student or teacher, \$5.00 a year.

Extra copies this Letter:

1 to 10	10c each
11 to 99	7c each
*100	\$6.00
*500	\$5.00 per 100
*1000	\$4.00 per 100

Special prices for larger quantities on request
Please add 2 per cent sales tax for deliveries in
Greater New York.

* Plus 3% shipping charges.

To All Interested Readers:

Obtaining new subscriptions to Economic Council publications can result in a tidy increase of income either to retired persons or to young men or women.

Perhaps your son or daughter, or some friend, would enjoy being our subscription representative during the summer months. Among your acquaintances many may be as eager as yourself to read Council publications—when they know about them.

Write us for details. Address:

Special Assistant Secretary
7501 Empire State Building
New York 1, N. Y.